

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

YURIY V. VASILCHUCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. DOERER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-0792 JLT SAB (PC)

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF**

(Docs. 5, 7)

Yury Vasilchuck initiated this action pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Federal Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), seeking to hold the defendants liable for violations of his civil rights while incarcerated at United States Penitentiary Atwater related to a lockdown at the facility that occurred from August to October 2024. (*See generally* Doc. 1.) Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief related to processes during lockdown and mail. (Doc. 5.) The magistrate judge found Plaintiff is unable to obtain the relief requested at this time and recommended the Court deny the motion for injunctive relief. (Doc. 7 at 1-2.)

The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 7 at 3.) The Court advised him that the "failure to file any objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights on appeal." (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed.

1 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a *de novo* review of this case.
2 Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations to
3 be supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 4 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued July 18, 2025 (Doc. 7) are
5 **ADOPTED** in full.
- 6 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 5) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: **August 12, 2025**


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE